DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 700 FL 004 013

AUTHOR Purcell, John M.
TITLE The Role of the State Foreign Language Supervisor: Its Development and Direction Since 1958.
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Language Instruction; *Modern Languages; *State Foreign Language Supervisors; State Standards; State Supervisors; State Surveys; Statistical Surveys; Supervision; *Supervisor Qualifications; *Supervisory Activities

ABSTRACT

An overall view of the role of the state foreign language supervisor is developed in this report. The function of the position is examined from the local, state, and national levels. The present role of the supervisor at the statewide level is examined from the point of view of (1) chief functions, (2) liaison activities, (3) teacher education, (4) curriculum (5) materials and research, and (6) other services. Reasons for continuing support for the position are presented. Successful supervisory practices and policies and several "deficient" aspects of the position are examined. Major achievements of the supervisors during the past 15 years are also noted. The study concludes with several tables of statistical data. (RL)

ED 072700

John M. Purcell
4805 Glenway Avenue, Apt. 37
Cincinnati, Ohio 45238

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ROLE OF THE STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR: ITS DEVELOPMENT AND DIRECTION SINCE 1958

For foreign language supervision on the state level, 1958 marked the beginning of a new emphasis. In that year, the National Defense Education Act was passed by Congress to promote, together with other selected disciplines, the teaching of foreign languages. Title III of the Act provided funds for a number of specific purposes, among which was the establishment, at the state level, of a foreign language supervisor.

The position of state foreign language supervisor was virtually unknown nationwide prior to 1958. New York, in 1912, had been first to establish the office of foreign language supervisor at the state level, and in the two score years which followed, only two other states, Pennsylvania (1920-1922) and New Mexico (1944), followed suit. Following 1958, however, forty-seven more states, as well as Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, established such an office, even though, in many cases, qualified personnel were unavailable to fill the position. (See Table 1).

FL004 013

The new supervisors who took office soon after 1958 were obliged, for lack of direction or guidelines, to create the role which they themselves were going to fulfill. As James R. Powers, former state supervisor from Massachusetts, points out, the new state foreign language supervisors taking office were pioneers without tradition or guidelines; teachers of teachers, but with no course of study or syllabus.[1] In spite of the fact that the state foreign language supervisor tended to work alone, having generally rather superficial contacts with the other state supervisors of foreign languages, the role that has developed among them during the past decade is remarkably uniform, with only minor differences attributable to such factors as density of population, geographical size and location, and the amount of state funds available.

What, indeed, does a state foreign language supervisor do? Has the position contributed to the overall development of foreign language education in the nation? Since the state foreign language supervisors have now been active a bit more than a decade, it is appropriate to examine whether the NDEA money for the position was well spent, and to determine what the benefits of the state supervisors' work has been. The following discussion is based on questionnaires received from the state foreign language supervisors, both past and present, and their immediate superiors.[2]

The Present Role of the State Foreign Language Supervisor

The present role of the state foreign language supervisor is composed of three frequently overlapping facets, dealing with functions on the state-wide level, on the local level, and on the national level. At the state-wide level, the state supervisor performs a wide variety of functions and services which can be grouped somewhat broadly into six categories, to be considered in the following order: (1) Chief Functions; (2) Liaison Activities; (3) Teacher Education; (4) Curriculum, Materials, and Research; (5) Evaluation; and (6) Other Services.

The chief functions of the state supervisors are really two: consultant and supervisor. By far the greater part of the supervisors--31, or 66%--prefer to be thought of as a "consultant" rather than a "supervisor". In this capacity, the supervisor is a person whose chief function is to counsel, guide, and advise concerning foreign language education on all levels within his state. His advice may be directed in a wide range from the classroom teacher to the state legislator, depending upon the need of the moment, but the state supervisor must be versatile enough to handle the questions and problems concerning the teaching of foreign languages within his state by any individual or agency which comes to him for help. Only secondarily is he a "supervisor" in the antiquated sense

that he may enforce definitive policies or play an administrative role for his state; just six of the state supervisors (13%) consider this to be their chief job, while most avoid this aspect entirely. The immediate superiors of the supervisors also emphasize the consultant aspect, but, in addition, lay stress on the supervisor's functions as a leader in foreign language education within his state. The former state supervisors include both the consultant and leadership aspects of the role in thier comments, but tend to underscore the area of coordination as the one receiving the greatest emphasis during their personal tenure on the job. Nationwide, the consultant aspect of the supervisor's job is by far the more important.

A second important function of the state foreign language supervisor is his work as a liaison person in the coordination and articulation of foreign language programs within his state. In this connection, the supervisor performs a variety of services: he acts as a liaison between his state and foreign language organizations, or between the state and higher education; he arranges state and district meetings; he works on state articulation or liaison committees for the purpose of providing articulation in foreign language programs in his state from FLES through the university; he makes many speaking engagements; and he handles many facets of public

relations for his state in connection with foreign language education.

The area of Teacher Education is a third significant function of the state supervisor. In this area, the state supervisor is frequently the individual in the state who disseminates new ideas and information concerning foreign language methodology and research to the various educational levels in his state, with a view to the improvement of instruction. He is a major catalyst in the planning and development of workshops and conferences held within his state for purposes of inservice education; he often assists in the planning and preparation of teacher training programs in the universities of his state, and not infrequently participates in them; and he occasionally helps in the placement of teachers and student teachers.

A fourth area of participation for the state foreign language supervisor is the comprehensive category of Curriculum, Materials, and Research. The state supervisor works closely with all levels in matters of curriculum. In twenty-four states and territories (53%) there is a foreign language program with objectives defined according to grade level designation, some more specifically than others. Only four of the state supervisors (8%), including the acting supervisor from Kentucky, report that they do not help in the development and/or the revision of curriculum guides. Twenty-

six supervisors (55%) are involved in both aspects, development and revision; ten (21%) report working in the area of development only, while six (13%) state that they are concerned with revision only. Two supervisors volunteer comments that they are not completely convinced as to the worth of such curriculum guides.

Other facets of curriculum development with which the supervisor is associated include such varied activities as the following: the development of new foreign language programs; educational television programs; the teaching of English as a second language (to immigrants or cultural minorities); bilingual education; migrant worker education; and social studies and language arts programs incorporating some aspect of foreign language education.

Instructional materials are closely identified with curriculum functions. A number of supervisors cite their involvement in the development and dissemination of instructional materials; a few serve on state textbook committees in an advisory capacity.

Research activities of the state foreign language supervisor include empirical research studies, as well as statistical research studies on teachers and pupils. Several state supervisors comment that their office is a sort of "clearing-house" for all information in or out of the state that deals with foreign languages and foreign language education.

Another function of the state foreign language supervisor is that of evaluation. The chief responsibility for the supervisor here is the review and evaluation of various projects and materials in foreign language education within the state, often to determine whether or not they should receive state support. A portion of the evaluation area for a few supervisors consists of visiting schools and evaluating teachers for the purpose of accreditation, often in conjunction with regional agencies such as the North Central Association. A few supervisors also work in the areas of teacher certification and state examination programs such as New York's Regent Examinations.

The last descriptive category of the supervisor's state-wide functions, Other Services, describes a number of miscellaneous functions of the state supervisor which are not necessarily directly related to teaching. Among these varied services are such items as international education and student overseas projects; assistance to the State Department of Education's library service; editorial work for the Division of Instruction; guidance services; county services; work with disadvantaged groups; work with school plant specifications (such as the installation of language laboratories); and miscellaneous services for the governor's office or the state legislature.

Functions on the local level lie in two major areas: work with the individual teacher and the local supervisor, and work with administrators and college/university personnel. Specific services which the state foreign language supervisor provides for the individual teacher, as well as, where applicable, the local foreign language supervisor, include three broad categories: (1) Teacher Education, (2) Teacher Information, and (3) Teacher Opportunities. The number of these services of which any one teacher (or local supervisor) takes advantage will depend, of course, on his own needs and the amount of contact that he has with the state supervisor.

The category of Teacher Education comprises a wide variety of activities designed to help the teacher on-the-job. The most significant of these is the classroom visitation and individual consultation with the teacher. Next in importance are in-service programs and workshops, both state-wide and local. Thirty-nine supervisors (83%) report regularly scheduled workshops for the teachers in their states, and two of the remaining eight cite workshops on the basis of need rather than on any schedule. (Significantly, in two states where workshops had been held on a regular basis, and where the position has been vacant for one and three years respectively, there have been no workshops for foreign language teachers during this time.)

The workshops held by the state supervisors vary considerably in frequency and duration, ranging from one workshop biennially on a state-wide basis to thirty annually on a local basis, and lasting from a few hours to several weeks. Many states schedule the local workshop on an "as-needed" basis, so that the number of these workshops may vary markedly from year to year. Size of the state, also, helps to determine the nature and location of the workshop: teachers in a small state can readily travel to a geographical center for a workshop state-wide, but in the larger, more populous states it is often more feasible to hold several workshops in strategic locations--commonly large metropolitan areas--around the state.

Apart from formal workshops, the state supervisor may also lend his expertise to school departmental meetings, simple teaching demonstrations, or provide temporary leadership to get needed projects underway.

Teacher Information, the second category, emphasizes the resource nature of the state foreign language supervisor. In this connection, he performs a whole host of services which include the following: answering the requests of individual teachers or local supervisors; sending numerous materials such as instructional aids, guidelines, courses of study, professional materials, specific language materials, information concerning new trends in foreign language methodology, resource lists,

summaries of research, and the state foreign language newsletter; assisting with the selection of texts and equipment; developing pilot programs; and distributing NDEA materials which are channeled through his office.

The last category of services for the teacher, Teacher Opportunities, demonstrates how the state supervisor can help the individual teacher and local supervisor through the great many contacts on every level which come very naturally as part of his job. He can, for example, aid in obtaining scholarships, both for deserving students, and teachers who wish to do graduate work. He can alert the teacher and local supervisor to summer school opportunities, and provide recommendations for graduate schools or other positions. He may be of help specifically to the local supervisor or administrator by notifying them of opportunities for teacher or program improvement arising from evaluation programs, or by assisting in teacher recruitment.

Concerning the state foreign language supervisor's work with the administrator, it is safe to say that the number of contacts that he has with a school's or school system's administrative personnel are probably at least equal to contacts with the teacher. The first person whom most supervisors see when visiting a school or school district is the administrator--most often the principal, but the whole hierarchy that

prevails may be seen at one time or another, if for no other reason than that of protocol. The supervisor visits for post-classroom visitation or post-evaluation conferences, through the accreditation procedures of schools, or simply to honor the request of the administrator, as appropriate. The administrator not infrequently visits the state supervisor in his office for counsel; moreover, a good deal of correspondence is carried on between them. In addition, the administrator usually receives a copy of the foreign language newsletter.

Meetings of various sorts are another source of contact between the administrator and the state supervisor: the supervisor may attend administrator's association meetings, and administrators sometimes sit in on the supervisor's workshops or conferences. Only twelve supervisors (25%), however, report holding workshops for administrators, curriculum directors and/or guidance personnel. A number of states, however, have various educational committees on which both supervisor and administrator are asked to work together.

Rapport is also important in dealing with college and university personnel. The state foreign language supervisor rarely has any direct control over college personnel, so that what sort of ambiance exists between them will largely be the doing of the supervisor himself. In this area, the state supervisor is often a liaison

person between higher education and the secondary and elementary programs. A number of states have formal articulation or advisory committees formed of college personnel, and usually the state supervisor is a member. College faculty members, moreover, are often invited by the state supervisor to take part in workshops or conferences, and there is commonly a good spirit of cooperation in the promotion and development of the state's foreign language organizational meetings.

The state foreign language supervisor is involved, in twelve states (25% of the respondents), with teacher education and certification programs in foreign languages at the college level. As a kind of adjunct to this aspect, the state supervisor on occasion is guest lecturer to classes in foreign language methodology, or to faculty meeting discussions. Two state supervisors are themselves faculty members of university evening colleges. In one state the supervisor is a part of the periodical evaluation of college and university programs; in another, the state supervisor works with college personnel in the improvement of the state's Regent Examinations in foreign languages.

Otherwise, many of the services for the college/university personnel are similar to those for the teacher, local supervisor, and administrator. The supervisor provides the college faculty members with materials,

bulletins, research and survey data; assists in projects and answers requests; and generally attempts to keep open the lines of communication between his office and the campus.

National functions are generally of two types; on the one hand, work with federal programs, and, on the other hand, various interstate connections. With reference to the former, the state foreign language supervisor deals with a number of federal legislative acts in the area of education which provide for the states and territories to obtain federal funds to assist in developing various aspects of the foreign language program within the state. The program most widely used by the states is the National Defense Education Act, which, in 1958, was the first major source of funds. Subsequent major legislation includes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Education Professions Development Act, from which many states have received funds. (See Table 2). Additionally, a few states have been able to avail themselves of funds from the Bilingual Education Act, Fullbright-Hays Act, Higher Education Act, and the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities (Humanities Act). One state, besides, has received a grant from the Ford Foundation (a private foundation). Future monies are expected--"hopefully," as most supervisors stress--from the same sources, as well as, in one case,

the Educational Media Act. The uncertainty of availability of funds is a dilemma shared in common by the state supervisors nationwide.

The other national function of the state foreign language supervisor, that of interstate connections, is somewhat less defined. Interstate contacts among the state supervisors of foreign languages range from formal coordination of projects to the more informal sharing of information, ideas, and services. In addition, the supervisors have organized themselves into a rather select group known as the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NCSSFL), which attempts to play a significant role in coordination of activities among the state supervisors in order to improve the teaching of foreign languages nationally.

Eight supervisors (17%) report being engaged in some coordination or project with another state at the present time. Two states, for example, are engaged in the coordination of a bilingual education project; two supervisors recently exchanged places with each other for a month, on special leave from their own states; one state supervisor is developing migrant education materials for other states; one state has an experimental FLES program underway in an adjoining state where the state foreign language supervisor,s position is vacant; one supervisor is a teaching participant in the foreign language seminar

of a neighboring state; and several state supervisors comment that they are sharing information and extend mutual invitations to state-wide foreign language functions. A number further comment that they are involved in a NCSSFL committee.

The number of supervisors who have in the past participated in out-of-state organizations is, however, at twenty-five (53%), considerably larger than for those presently so engaged. Thirteen supervisors have participated once or twice in some manner in another state from their own, but four supervisors have participated six or more times, with one supervisor participating as many as thirteen times. The nature of such participation is varied, and includes work with international projects, national organizations, regional and state organizations, educational institutions, and foreign language conferences.

In summary, then, the state foreign language supervisor can be said to be an individual who is active in the stimulus, implementation, and evaluation of quality programs in foreign language education on the local, state-wide, and national levels.

The Relevance and Value of Continuing the Foreign Language Supervisor's Position at the State Level

A major concern at the present time, now that federal monies to support the position of state foreign

language supervisor are disappearing, is whether the state should assume the support of the position, and whether the continuance of such a position, from the point of view of administrators and/or legislators, is justifiable.[3] The investigation undertaken by this writer shows that continuing the foreign language supervisor's position at the state level is both relevant and of value.

On the national level the state foreign language supervisor is the knowledgeable individual in his state to deal with federal programs in foreign languages, and is the one who coordinates interstate programs and communication in foreign language education. Within his state, both on the state and local levels, the state foreign language supervisor performs highly specialized services of a leadership, consultative, and coordinative nature not easily administered by short-term consultants or "generalist" supervisors. His training and experience alone give the supervisor a distinct advantage over the generalist, and if any sense of continuity or articulation in programs within the state is to be achieved, they must be guided by an individual on a full-time basis, something the guest consultant, however well qualified otherwise, simply does not have the time to do. While one might expect the supervisor himself to point out these factors, and he does, both the immediate superior group and the

former supervisor group indicate, repeatedly, the same ideas. Moreover, if more proof were needed, one could come to the same conclusion merely be analyzing the job descriptions of the state foreign language supervisor as provided by the three groups: the functions performed by the foreign language supervisor are so diverse and so many that only a highly skilled individual trained in foreign language education could perform them competently.

Additional evidence of the need for the position is the fact that, according to the state supervisors themselves (persons likely to be sensitive to any threat to their jobs), 87% of the states and territories represented among the respondents regard the position as necessary. Of the same group, 70% believe the position has considerable prestige and influence within the state. The job is seen by the immediate superior, from a more objective viewpoint, as having contributed significantly to the state's foreign language education by 91% of the respondents where the state supervisor is active, and 100% of the respondents where the position is vacant! Former state supervisors (28%), besides, volunteer comments about the need for the continuance of the position.

In large areas of the United States where there are no local foreign language supervisors, the state foreign language supervisor is the only individual of

his kind to whom the teacher can turn for aid. If a position becomes vacant, the teacher is left to "go it alone", and the level of excellence in the foreign language programs often slips lower. State administrators who, for one reason or another, allow the position to go unfilled, must accept a large share of the blame for lack of quality within the area of foreign languages, and the erosion of the structure built by the efforts of the former supervisor while on the job. It is probably not an exaggeration, however, to suppose that such state administrators are likely to care very little one way or the other unless for some reason a spotlight on their foreign language programs results in unfavorable publicity such as came after Sputnik in 1958. If the position is to be continued generally, it must, therefore, be concluded that the job of the profession of foreign language educators is to urge support of the position's continuance for higher quality programs.

Supervisory Practices or Policies Which Appear To Work Well

A number of practices or policies indicated by respondents appear to work well in the area of state foreign language supervision. Some are more widely implemented than others; they are presented here for informative purposes so that those not using them may consider them for their own states.

First would appear to be the hiring of well qualified individuals for the position of state foreign language supervisor. The present group of supervisors as a whole, all factors considered, seem to be well prepared on the basis of education and experience, and show a continuing interest in self-improvement through travel, writing, and the support of professional organizations.[4]

Secondly, the state foreign language supervisor has evinced success in the wide variety of services performed, as indicated by the description of the supervisory role. Most important of these services seem to be consultative, with emphasis on visitation of teachers and administrators, and the coordinative efforts involving college/university personnel. It has apparently worked well to have the foreign language supervisor as the individual in charge of the federally funded programs for his state; many of the supervisors have been successful in obtaining federal funds for desired programs.

Thirdly, the position appears to be most solidly established in those states which provide 100% of the funds for the position. This appears to be true because the supervisor in such states does not have to worry what will happen to his position when federal funds expire. Further, those states which support the

position entirely with state funds give evidence of recognizing the position's importance and a willingness to continue its support. In the case where the position is established wholly or in part with federal funds, it would seem advisable to decide at the position's inception how it will be maintained if federal funds are cut off, in order to ensure program continuity.

Deficiencies Presently Existing in State Foreign Language Supervision

The overriding deficiency in present-day state foreign language supervision is the problem of existing and occurring vacancies in the position. Of the some dozen vacancies presently among the states (the number fluctuates with some frequency), only about a quarter appear likely to be filled in the near future. The reasons given for vacancies are monetary--expiration of federal funds and/or budget cutting by state administrators--and an announced trend toward the hiring of "generalist" supervisors among the states. In those states with no state foreign language supervisor, the leadership characteristic of states with a supervisor is lacking, and the foreign language program tends to fall into disarray.

Another deficiency presently existing is the relatively high turnover in the position (see Tables 5 and

6), attributable in large measure to the following four factors:

1. Salary. The wide range of the salary scale nationwide is too great. Starting salaries begin below $8,000 in some places, while in others the starting salary may be over $16,000; maximum salaries range from between $8,000 and $10,000 to $18,000 or above--in both cases the gap between the one end and the other seems to be inordinate. Presently an almost equal number of state foreign language supervisors earn less than $10,000 as earn over $14,000. Supervisors on the job, however, do not cite salary as a major reason for their contemplation of leaving the job, although it is certainly a consideration. Roughly one-quarter of the former supervisors cite low salary as a reason for having left the job (see Table 7).

2. Travel allowance schedules. The schedules by which state supervisors are reimbursed for travel, food, and lodging as part of their job seem to vary widely and to be unnecessarily complicated. Because these schedules apply to all state personnel, however, the task to attempt to simplify them or make them more equitable, given the cumbersome machinery of state legislatures, seems to lie well beyond the sphere of influence of the state supervisor. Moreover, there is frequent reference on the part of both active and

former supervisors to the difficulty in obtaining necessary permission and funds to attend meetings, conferences, and the like, particularly out-of-state. In order to strengthen cooperation among the states, more time and more money for travel are needed to allow supervisors an opportunity to participate in programs and exchange ideas.

3. Administration. Both active and former supervisors point to administrative problems. The general tone of complaint is of not having enough freedom to develop his role as the supervisor would like, having to contend with too many directives and too much "red-tape". Further, in some states the specter of the administrator who plays politics is also a factor which detracts from job effectiveness. It should be pointed out, however, that administrative restraints are mentioned by only about one-third of the present supervisors and about one-fourth of the former supervisors, so that the others apparently do not consider them strong enough to be a major factor.

4. Overwork. The state foreign language supervisor is a very busy individual--often too busy to accomplish all that he needs or wants to. Besides the stack of paper-work to be done, requests and calls constantly pour in for help from individuals and agencies all over the state. In establishing priorities, some matters must be delayed or omitted. Often

the addition of clerical and/or para-professional staff would free the supervisor to take care of matters which he alone is qualified to handle. The fact that 34% of the present supervisors spend 20% or less of their time in classroom visitation and/or teacher consultation is evidence of the pressure of responsibilities (see Table 8).

Services of the State Foreign Language Supervisor Which Are Needed To Maintain an Effective Program in the Event of Vacancy

In those states where the position of state foreign language supervisor has become vacant, by and large the foreign language program is left, like Topsy, to "just grow". State administrative matters are handled by generalist supervisors in some cases, other generalists provide information on such matters as the effective use of media, but that appears to be the extent of state help. As a number of respondents comment, the universities of the state are too occupied with running their own programs to have any time left over to devote to helping the public schools. Consequently, it seems advisable and appropriate to identify those services which the state foreign language supervisor would ordinarily perform that should be continued in order to ensure an effective program in foreign language education state-wide.

An examination of the total role of the state foreign language supervisor indicates the following areas of service which seem to be necessary:

1. Consultative services. The major aspect of the state supervisor's role presently, such services need to be maintained to the teacher, the local supervisor, the administrator, and college/university personnel. Of these the teacher is the most important.

2. Coordination. An effort should be maintained to coordinate the work of the various state foreign language personnel and organizations. Liaison should be maintained between the public schools and higher education in the interest of better articulation.

3. Teacher education. Workshops and in-service programs sponsored by qualified personnel should be held on a regular basis to ascertain that teachers will be kept informed on latest methodology. Some qualified agency or individual should be responsible for the publication of the state foreign language newsletter in order to keep the state's teachers informed of late research, recent developments, and pertinent information concerning meetings and materials.

4. Curriculum, Materials, and Research. Qualified individuals will be needed by school systems to help in the development of current guides in foreign language education. Someone qualified must help to develop, select, demonstrate, and distribute materials

as needed. Some knowledgeable person should direct data gathering and related informal research activities in foreign languages and compile needed statistics.

5. Evaluation. Qualified personnel should be secured to evaluate current programs in foreign languages within the states for remedial purposes. Additional qualified personnel should be available to assay the merits of proposed programs involving the use of federal monies.

It appears self-evident that the dispersal of so many services would result in monumental inefficiency, with one individual, working on his own, entirely uninformed of what someone else may be doing in the performance of a related service. What happens, of course, is that almost none of the services are, in fact, performed without the state foreign language supervisor, and ipso facto the state's foreign language program is no longer as effective.

The Importance of the State Foreign Language Supervisor to Date

The impact that the state foreign language supervisors have had in the field of foreign language education is not always easily discerned, because of the multitude of changes generally in foreign language education during the past decade, and because of the federal legislation which made programs possible that

otherwise probably would not have developed so rapidly; indeed, the very position of state supervisor in most states owes its existence to the impetus provided by NDEA money. Yet, in looking back over what the state supervisors have done--and are doing--the salient feature is the fact that the state foreign language supervisor, more than any one other individual in his state, has been providing direction. This is not to say that he has been a trail-blazer in the development of new methodology necessarily, but he has been rather the individual who has been able to perceive the latest in trends and ideas, to synthesize the best of these, and to pass these ideas on in practical form to the teachers in his state.

The early years of state foreign language supervision, necessarily devoted as they were to tasks of organization of the state's foreign language program, and to developing the role identity of the state supervisor's job, did not produce an immediate major impact on the teaching field. Nonetheless, as the years went by and the state foreign language supervisor had familiarized himself with the problems in his state, he began to act to upgrade foreign language programs in his state.

The success of the state foreign language supervisor at work can be evaluated in two ways: (1) tangible results, such as in the increase in the number of teachers,

classes, and course offerings in foreign languages, the number of curriculum guides developed, workshops held, materials disseminated, and publications prepared; and (2) intangible results, dealing with interpersonal relationships, teacher satisfactions, leadership and "selling" activities, and evidence of cooperation with the profession at large, especially in his home state.

Applying these two criteria to the record of the state foreign language supervisors so far, one can see that much as been accomplished in both areas. The tangible accomplishments are the more obvious, and in the case of most of the states where a state foreign language supervisory program has been in effect on a continuous basis for a number of years, the record is impressive: foreign language education has grown and flourished as never before.[5] The intangible results are not readily measured, but will frequently show up as part of the tangible results. The personality of the state supervisor is probably one of the most important factors contributing to the area of intangible results, and obviously some supervisors have been possessed with a more persuasive or pleasing personality than others, but almost all have been sincere in their efforts to improve foreign language education within their states.

Although the success of the individual supervisor may depend largely on his own abilities to discern the problems and attack them, there is another important element to the supervisor's success which cannot be ignored: time. No supervisor, regardless of personal abilities, can expect to effect changes immediately, and for this reason, those supervisors in any one state who have been on the job for more than three years are the ones who are likely to be able to point to the most successes. The reason appears obvious: the supervisor on the job for one or two years will have his hands full simply in orienting himself to the state's needs, special problems, and traditions. The supervisor must meet hundreds of people and learn how best to use their abilities in his efforts to improve the state's foreign language program. In those states where the state supervisor is on the job a year or two before being replaced by another for a similar period of time, there is not time for a sense of continuity to develop, nor a chance to bring special projects to fruition. The career supervisor is the one who, ultimately, will do the most for his state's foreign language program.

The impact, then, of the state foreign language supervisor over the previous decade has been considerable, on the whole. Some states, because of more favorable conditions than others, have seen the greatest benefits

from the position's establishment. This is especially true of those states which have had the same supervisor incumbent for more than three years. In those states where the position was filled for a period of time and then vacated, the impact of the state supervisor has been considerably less, and of course, the longer the position has been vacant, the more diluted by time have been any achievements of the supervisor while he was in office.

Whether the many merits of continuing and expanding the functions of the state foreign language supervisor will, in fact, be realized in the future remains to be seen. It is not without justification, however, to say that the cause of foreign language education in the United States since 1958 owes no small measure of its success to the state foreign language supervisors, who have helped to develop guidelines in unfamiliar areas, and who, by their efforts, have helped to lay the foundations for excellence.

THE END

NOTES

[1]James R. Powers, "The State Supervisors," The Language Laboratory and Language Learning, ed. Elton Hocking, Department of Audio-visual Instruction, NEA (Washington, D. C., 1964), pp. 124-125.

[2]For complete details regarding the population and the questionnaires, see the unpubl. diss. (The Ohio State University, 1969) by John M. Purcell, "Role Definition of the State Foreign Language Supervisor," Chapter I. Briefly, a questionnaire of 54 questions dealing with four facets of the supervisory role was sent to 55 state and territorial supervisors, of whom 48 responded, representing every state but Delaware where a state foreign language supervisor is on the job, and the three territories (Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands). A second questionnaire to the immediate superior, 5 questions in length, was sent to all 50 states and the 3 territories. Replies were received from 41 states and 1 territory. A third questionnaire of six questions was sent to the 48 former state foreign language supervisors who could be located; replies were received from 26. Percentages referred to in the text are based on the number of respondents.

[3]Only 5 states and the 3 territories presently provide 90% to 100% of the funds for the position of state

foreign language supervisor. Most states share the cost with the federal government on a 50% - 50% basis, although as many as 7 states rely on federal funds 100% (see Table 4).

[4]All but four of the supervisors hold the master's degree; one has a doctorate (Ed. D.). All, except one Acting Supervisor, had taught foreign languages for at least two years before going into supervision, although the greatest number had taught at least five years. Thirteen state supervisors had done supervision on the local level prior to the state level. Over 50% of the state supervisors are proficient in more than one language. All have lived or studied abroad in a total of 38 different countries. Sixty-nine percent have publications to their credit, and all are active in numerous professional organizations.

[5]Two selected examples of the value of the supervisor's work: (1) in Arkansas in 1958, there were 2,681 students enrolled in foreign languages. By 1968 the number had increased to 17,833 students, and the number of teachers from 73 to 369. Additionally, the number of FLES teachers in the state increased from 5 to 100. (2) In Pennsylvania, due to the work of the state supervisor, the state has adopted a minimum four-year requirement in foreign language study. While accomplishments in other states are less dramatic, they are generally equally as encouraging.

TABLE 1

DATE OF FOUNDING OF POSITION OF
STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR, BY STATE

State	Year	State	Year
1. Alabama	1960	28. Nevada	1960
2. Alaska	1966	29. New Hampshire	1959
3. Arizona	1966	30. New Jersey	1959
4. Arkansas	1959	31. New Mexico	1944
5. California	1959	32. New York	1912
6. Colorado	1959	33. North Carolina	1959
7. Connecticut	1959	34. North Dakota	1965
8. Delaware	1960	35. Ohio	1959
9. Florida	1959	36. Oklahoma	1962
10. Georgia	1958	37. Oregon	1959
11. Hawaii	1959	38. Pennsylvania	1920[a]
12. Idaho	1959	39. Rhode Island	1958
13. Illinois	1959	40. South Carolina	1959
14. Indiana	1959	41. South Dakota	1961[b]
15. Iowa	1962	42. Tennessee	1960
16. Kansas	1959	43. Texas	1960
17. Kentucky	1963	44. Utah	1958
18. Louisiana	1964	45. Vermont	1959
19. Maine	1959	46. Virginia	1959
20. Maryland	1960	47. Washington	1963
21. Massachusetts	1959	48. West Virginia	1959
22. Michigan	1964	49. Wisconsin	1959
23. Minnesota	1959	50. Wyoming	1968
24. Mississippi	1966	51. Guam	1967
25. Missouri	1959	52. Puerto Rico	1959
26. Montana	1960	53. Virgin Islands	1963
27. Nebraska	1966		

[a]Established in Pennsylvania in 1920, the position was vacated in 1922 and remained so until 1958.

[b]The position was recommended in 1961 by South Dakota's State Foreign Language Curriculum Committee, but it has never been filled, and the present plans are to omit it altogether.

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF STATES/TERRITORIES RECEIVING FUNDS THROUGH FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Name of Legislation	Number of States/Territories[a]
Bilingual Education Act	1
Education Professions Development Act (Titles not specified)	10
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	
Title I	12
Title II	4
Title III	12
Title V	6
Title VII	5
Title not specified	8
Fullbright-Hays Act (Foreign Language Curriculum Specialist)	2
Higher Education Act	1
National Defense Education Act	
Title I	3
Title II	2
Title III	25
Title V	3
Title VI	1
Title XI	1
Title not specified	15
National Foundation of Arts and Humanities	2
Not receiving funds	1
Not reported	2

[a]Reports from the three Illinois respondents are different, and are therefore recorded separately.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF STATES/TERRITORIES EXPECTING TO RECEIVE FUNDS THROUGH FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Name of Legislation	Number of States/Territories[a]
Bilingual Education Act	2
Education Professions Development Act	
Title V	1
Title VI	1
Title not specified	12
Educational Media Act	1
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	
Title I	4
Title II	3
Title III	7
Title V	8
Title VII	7
Fullbright-Hays Act	1
National Defense Education Act	
Title III	12
Title not specified	5
No funds expected	1
Uncertain	7
Not reported	6

[a]Illinois' three respondents are recorded separately.

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE STATE OR TERRITORIAL GOVERNMENTS FOR THE POSITION OF STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR

Percentage	Number of States:	Territories:
100	4	2
95	1	0
90	0	1
+++	++	++
60	1	0
+++	++	++
50	24	0
+++	++	++
0	7	0
Not reported	5	0

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS
STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS HAVE HELD OFFICE
(AS OF 1969)

Number of Years	Number of Supervisors
12	1
10	5
9½	1
9	2
8	2
7½	1
7	2
6½	2
6	3
5	5
4	4
3½	2
2	3
1½	3
1	5
Less than 1	1

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CONSECUTIVE YEARS
FORMER STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS HELD OFFICE

Number of Years	Number of Supervisors
7	1
6	1
5	4
4	2
3	6
2	10[a]
1	3[a]

[a]Figures for these years include one person listed twice, the only former supervisor responding to have held the post in two different states: two years in Indiana and one year in Hawaii.

TABLE 7

SALARY RANGE OF
THE STATE SUPERVISORS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES[a]

Amount	Starting Salary: Number of States	Present Salary: Number of States	Maximum Salary: Number of States
$ 8,000 or below	9	0	0
$ 8,000 to $10,000	19	8	1
$10,000 to $12,000	8	17	10
$12,000 to $14,000	1	13	12
$14,000 to $16,000	3	4	7
$16,000 to $18,000	1	3	3
$18,000 or above	0	2	4
Not reported	7	1	9

[a]The three supervisors from Illinois report different salary scales, and they are therefore recorded separately.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISOR'S TOTAL TIME SPENT IN CLASSROOM VISITATION

Percentage	Number of Supervisors
75	2
70	0
65	1
60	1
55	0
50	6
45	0
40	3
35	2
30	2
25	10
20	3
15	2
10	7
5	4
2	1
0	2[a]
Not reported	1

[a]Includes Kentucky's Acting Supervisor